

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
10

11 CHRISTIAN DAVID ENTO,  
12 Plaintiff,  
13 v.  
14 STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
15 Defendant.  
16

No. 2:23-CV-2006-DMC-P

ORDER

and

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

17 Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to  
18 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 10, 2024, the Court directed Plaintiff to file an amended complaint  
19 within 30 days. Plaintiff was warned that failure to file an amended complaint may result in  
20 dismissal of this action for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with court rules and orders.  
21 See Local Rule 110. To date, Plaintiff has not complied.

22 The Court must weigh five factors before imposing the harsh sanction of dismissal.  
23 See Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000); Malone v. U.S. Postal  
24 Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987). Those factors are: (1) the public's interest in  
25 expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its own docket; (3) the risk of  
26 prejudice to opposing parties; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits;  
27 and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions. See id.; see also Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52,  
28 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam). A warning that the action may be dismissed as an appropriate

1 sanction is considered a less drastic alternative sufficient to satisfy the last factor. See Malone,  
2 833 F.2d at 132-33 & n.1. The sanction of dismissal for lack of prosecution is appropriate where  
3 there has been unreasonable delay. See Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir.  
4 1986). Dismissal has also been held to be an appropriate sanction for failure to comply with an  
5 order to file an amended complaint. See Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir.  
6 1992).

7 Having considered these factors, and in light of Plaintiff's failure to file an  
8 amended complaint as directed, the Court finds that dismissal of this action is appropriate.

9 Based on the foregoing, the undersigned orders and recommends as follows:

10 1. It is ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court is directed to randomly assign a  
11 District Judge.

12 2. It is RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed, without prejudice,  
13 for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with court rules and orders.

14 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District  
15 Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within 14 days  
16 after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written  
17 objections with the court. Responses to objections shall be filed within 14 days after service of  
18 objections. Failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal. See  
19 Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

20  
21 Dated: March 8, 2024



22 DENNIS M. COTA  
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28